



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/664,941	09/19/2000	Kuo-Chun Lee	CREO.005US0	5234

25242 7590 01/23/2004

VICTOR H. OKUMOTO
P.O. BOX 6120
FREMONT, CA 94538

EXAMINER

MASKULINSKI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 01/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/664,941

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

Michael C Maskulinski

Art Unit

2113

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 05 January 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
 - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The proposed amendments require a further search.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☒ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-3 and 5-31.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 4 and 32-37.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
10. ☒ Other: see attached paper no. 2

Grounds for Rejection

Claim Objections

1. Claims 7, 8, 12 and 13 are objected to because of the following informalities: these claims contain steps (f) and (g) which are different than steps (f) and (g) in independent claims 1 and 9. The Examiner believes that the steps in claims 7, 8, 12, and 13 should start with the designation (h) and end with the designation (k) and has interpreted these claims as such. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. Claims 22-24 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049, and further in view of Blaisdell et al., U.S. Patent 6,357,019 B1.


4. Claims 7, 8, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049 and Blaisdell et al., U.S. Patent 6,357,019 B1, and further in view of Schauser, U.S. Patent 6,331,855 B1.

5. Claims 14-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049, and further in view of Schauser, U.S. Patent 6,331,855 B1.

Art Unit: 2113

6. Claims 27 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049, and further in view of Cowart, Mastering Windows 98.

7. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cardoza et al., U.S. Patent 5,630,049.


ROBERT BEAUSOLIEL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100